

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT SEATTLE  
11

12               Ray Clarence Rogers,

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-1034

13               Plaintiff,

ORDER AFFIRMING DENIAL  
(DKT. NO. 98) OF MOTION FOR  
RECUSAL (DKT. NO. 90)

14               v.

15               King County et al,

Defendants.

16               This matter comes before the Court on United States Magistrate Judge Grady J.  
17 Leupold's order (Dkt. No. 98) denying Plaintiff's motion for recusal (Dkt. No. 90). Local Civil  
18 Rule 3(f) provides that whenever a judge in this District declines to voluntarily recuse themselves  
19 from a case following a party's motion to recuse pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144 or 28 U.S.C. § 455,  
20 "he or she will direct the clerk to refer the motion to the chief judge."

21               Recusal is required if a judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned or if the  
22 judge has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party. 28 U.S.C. § 455(a), (b)(1). In  
23 addition, recusal is required pursuant to § 144 when a party "files a timely and sufficient

1 affidavit that the judge before whom the matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either  
2 against him or in favor of any adverse party.” Critically, bias or prejudice sufficient to warrant  
3 recusal must derive from an extrajudicial source. *Agha-Khan v. Mortgage Elec. Registration*  
4 *Sys., Inc.*, 2022 WL 501564, at \*1 (9th Cir. Feb. 18, 2022); *Mayes v. Leipziger*, 729 F.2d 605,  
5 607 (9th Cir. 1984). In other words, prior rulings that are adverse to a party do not suffice as a  
6 legal basis on which to grant recusal. *Id.*; *United States v. Nelson*, 718 F.2d 315, 321 (9th Cir.  
7 1983).

8 The motion before the Court is Plaintiff’s second motion seeking the recusal of Judge  
9 Leupold. The Court denied Plaintiff’s first motion (Dkt. No. 58) on the grounds that Plaintiff did  
10 not identify any extrajudicial source of bias or prejudice because “[t]he entirety of Plaintiff’s  
11 motion [took] issue with prior judicial decisions of Judge Leupold.” (Dkt. No. 70 at 2.)  
12 Plaintiff’s instant motion must be denied on the same grounds. Plaintiff seeks recusal on the  
13 basis of the orders Judge Leupold has issued in this case and the sentiment that some of  
14 Plaintiff’s filings are being disregarded. As explained above, adverse rulings are not a basis for  
15 recusal. See *Nelson*, 718 F.2d at 321. The Court accordingly AFFIRMS Judge Leupold’s denial  
16 (Dkt. No. 98) of Plaintiff’s motion for recusal (Dkt. No. 90).

17 Dated this 22nd day of April 2024.



18  
19  
20 David G. Estudillo  
21  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24